

REMARKS

The Office action dated May 18, 2006, and the references cited therein have been received and carefully reviewed.

As a preliminary matter, the Office action was discussed between the undersigned and the Examiner on October 17, 2006, for which, the undersigned would like to thank the Examiner for taking the time to discuss the Office action and for the Examiner's helpful comments and suggestions.

Moreover, Applicant would like to thank the Examiner for an early indication of allowable subject matter in claims 10 and 13.

As a result of the Office action, claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Curchod; claims 3-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curchod; claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curchod in view of Huang; claim 11 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curchod in view of Reeves; claims 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Curchod in view of Cao; claims 3-8, 12, and 14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cao in view of Yeh; and, claims 1, 2, 9, and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Huang. These references

have been carefully reviewed but are not believed to show or suggest Applicant's invention as now claimed in any manner. Reconsideration and allowance of the pending claims, and examination and allowance of the newly added claim is therefore respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

According to MPEP 2131, a claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Moreover, according to MPEP 2143.03, to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art.

As agreed during the personal interview, claims 1-6, 10, and 14 have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer, and new claims 15-18 have been added. No new matter has been added. New claim 15, as agreed, now requires a first bowed section having a first ruffle portion creating an opening between a first front hem extension and the first bowed section, and a second bowed section having a second ruffle portion creating an opening between a second front hem extension and the second ruffle portion. Underlying the present invention is the Applicant's recognition to create a

continuous hem around the vehicle cover by the front hem, the first front hem extension, the first side peripheral edge, the second front hem extension, and the second side peripheral edge for securing the cover over the vehicle. As the created continuous hem is being pulled by the pair of fastening cords, the bowed sections are also anchored over the side mirrors thereby creating a form fitting cover over the vehicle.

As indicated and agreed during the personal, none of the cited prior art references, taken individually or in combination, teaches or suggests these limitations. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 15 is patentable over the prior art.

Claims 7-9, 11-13, and 16-18 are dependent from claim 15 and are therefore allowable for the reasons provided in connection with claim 15.

The prior art references made of record by the examiner have each been considered but are not believed to obviate against the allowability of the newly added claims. It is noted that none of these references has been specifically applied by the examiner against any of the original claims.

Each issue raised in the Office action dated May 18, 2006, has been addressed and it is believed that claims 7-9, 11-13, and 15-18 are in condition for allowance. Wherefore,

Applicant respectfully requests a timely Notice of Allowance
be issued in this case.

Respectfully submitted,
DENNISON, SCHULTZ
& MACDONALD



By: _____

Amir H. Behnia
Reg. No. 50,215
(703) 837-9600 Ext. 16

Date: 10/18/06